R E P O R T R E S U M E S

ED 011 131 EA 000 218

TEACHER PREPARATION PROGRAMS AND FIRST-YEAR TEACHER EFFECTIVENESS. FINAL REPORT.

BY- LUND, VICTOR E.
OREGON STATE SYSTEM OF HIGHER EDUCATION, MONMOUTH

REPORT NUMBER R-37 PUB DATE 15 MAR 65
EDRS PRICE MF-$0.09 HC-$0.88 22P.

DESCRIPTORS- *TEACHER EDUCATION, EDUCATIONAL PROGRAMS, *STUDENT TEACHERS, *TEACHER EVALUATION, *TIME BLOCKS, STATISTICAL ANALYSIS, QUESTIONNAIRES, MONMOUTH

A COMPARATIVE STUDY WAS MADE OF THE EFFECTIVENESS OF TWO TYPES OF TEACHER-TRAINING PROGRAMS INVOLVING 1962 AND 1963 GRADUATES, OF WHOM 242 HAD RECEIVED TRADITIONAL AND RELATIVELY UNCOORDINATED TRAINING AND 79 HAD RECEIVED A NEW INTEGRATED JUNIOR YEAR BLOCK TRAINING, WITH LESS COURSE OVERLAP AND MORE SPECIFIC LABORATORY TEACHING EXPERIENCE. EVALUATION OF THE TWO PROGRAMS INCLUDED RATINGS BY TEACHERS, PRINCIPALS, AND THE COLLEGE'S FIELD SERVICES COORDINATOR. UNSYSTEMATIZED AND INCOMPLETE DATA RESULTED IN FINDINGS WHICH WERE INDICATIVE BUT NOT CONCLUSIVE. TWENTY-NINE PERCENT OF THE TEACHERS RESPONDED TO THE QUESTIONNAIRE. LESS THAN 45 PERCENT OF THE TEACHERS WERE EVALUATED BY PRINCIPALS. AT THE .05 LEVEL OF SIGNIFICANCE, PRINCIPALS' EVALUATIONS SHOWED A SIGNIFICANT DIFFERENCE IN FAVOR OF BLOCK-TRAINED TEACHERS, BUT THE FIELD SERVICES COORDINATOR'S EVALUATIONS DID NOT REVEAL A SIGNIFICANT DIFFERENCE IN THE OBSERVED EFFECTIVENESS OF ONE PROGRAM OVER THE OTHER. EVALUATION DISCREPANCIES WERE ATTRIBUTED TO PRINCIPAL EVALUATIONS BASED ON A TOTAL YEAR'S PERFORMANCE, WHILE THE FIELD SERVICES COORDINATOR EVALUATIONS WERE BASED ON SPOT OBSERVATION EARLY IN THE YEAR. THE STUDY CONCLUDED THAT (1) NO SIGNIFICANT DIFFERENCE EXISTED BETWEEN SEXES IN TEACHERS' SELF-EVALUATION OF EFFECTIVENESS ATTRIBUTED TO EITHER OF THE PROGRAMS, (2) MALE STUDENTS HAD A TENDENCY TO CHOOSE THE BLOCK PROGRAM, (3) MALE TEACHERS FROM THE BLOCK PROGRAM EVALUATED THEMSELVES HIGHER THAN MALES FROM THE TRADITIONAL PROGRAM, AND (4) NO SELECTIVE PROCESS WAS APPARENT FOR ENROLLING CAPABLE STUDENTS IN EITHER OF THE PROGRAMS. (JK)

ED011131

TEACHER PREPARATION PROGRAMS

AND

FIRST-YEAR TEACHER EFFECTIVENESS

Victor E. Lund

Final Report

General Research Project

Oregon College of Education

OREGON STATE SYSTEM OF HIGHER EDUCATION

R-37

EA 000 218

Teacher Preparation Programs

and

First-Year Teacher Effectiveness.

Victor E. Lund

Final Report

March 15, 1965

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION & WELFARE
OFFICE OF EDUCATION

THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL OFFICE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY.

Teaching Research Division
Oregon State System of Higher Education
Monmouth, Oregon

The Research Reported Herein was
Supported by
the General Research Fund
Oregon College of Education
Monmouth, Oregon

Acknowledgments

Dr. Floyd B. Albin, Registrar, Oregon College of Education and the staff of the Registrar's Office supplied all available data relative to the academic background of the subjects in this study.

Mr. Loren L. Scott, Field Service Coordinator, Oregon College of Education, supplied all available data relative to the effectiveness of the subjects in this study.

Mr. Casper F. Paulson, Dr. Paul A. Twelker and Dr. James H. Beaird, Teaching Research Division, Oregon State System of Higher Education, contributed valuable time and counsel during the preparation of this report.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Introduction	1
Research Objectives	2
Procedures	2
Materials	2
Subjects	3
Data Collection	3
Findings	4
Discussion	5
Specific Conclusions and Recommendations	7
Tables	9
Appendices	12
A. Teacher Self-Evaluation	12
B. Principal's Evaluation	15
C. Field Service Coordinator's Evaluation	16

Introduction

In 1960 a new program of teacher preparation was put into effect at Oregon College of Education (OCE). This development was an outgrowth of several years of discussion by staff members of the Education Psychology Department who felt disatisfied with the effectiveness of the preparation program as it was organized. Although the staff was in general agreement on the need for modification and expansion, there were many proposed modifications. Eventually, however, a universal concern emerged for a more efficient organization of content and sequence of course materials and an increase in the amount of laboratory experience. A new program was developed subsequently and it was distinguished from the old in terms of two main characteristics: (1) scheduling of classes and (2) laboratory experience.

The old program was a pattern of three credit hour courses scheduled in sequential order. There was a feeling expressed during discussions that the content of various courses overlapped because of the similarity of subject matter and ultimate objectives. One feature of the new program was the integration and presentation of related courses in two-hour time blocks with the instructors collaborating on the content and sequence of learning experiences. Because students who enrolled in this program were in their junior year, the new program was given the name of "Junior Block." Hereafter in this report, this new program shall be referred to as the "Block" or the "Block Program," and the old program shall be referred to as the "Traditional Program."

In the Traditional Program, students' experiences with children prior to student teaching were mostly vicarious. These experiences came from observing demonstrations by visiting the classroom as well as observing classrooms by closed circuit television broadcasts. The Block Program expanded these experiences during the two terms prior to the student teaching experience. In the first of the two terms, Block students had two hours per week of contact with children during informal situations in classrooms and on the playground. During the second term these students were allowed to instruct small groups of Campus Elementary School children after planning with the supervising teacher.

Several OCE staff members who have been directly involved in the Block have stated that it places greater demands upon their time and energy and that these demands are often unequally divided among the staff. However, they feel satisfied that this program produces better teachers and they feel this outcome is compensation for the extra effort.

The Block Program has been in operation for four years with no documented evidence as to its effectiveness. This study was made to obtain such documentation to either substantiate the claim of increased effectiveness or serve as a basis for reappraising and modifying the program to achieve increased effectiveness.

Research Objectives

The objectives of the study were to answer the following questions:

1. Does the data indicate "noticeable" differences between the teachers who trained under the Traditional and Block Programs?
2. Is there a tendency for one sex to choose one preparation program in preference to the other?
3. Does one sex score higher than the other in self-evaluation?
4. Is there a selective process (intended or otherwise) for enrolling capable students in either program?
5. Do the present evaluation tools measure attainment of objectives with sufficient accuracy to give useable information?

Procedures

Materials for Observing and Recording Subjects' Behaviors

Three sources of data were: (1) the teacher who participated in the Block Program or Traditional Program, (2) the teacher's principal, and (3) the Field Services Coordinator for Oregon College of Education. Check lists were used to rate the teacher in various performance categories. The rating forms had been developed previously by college personnel and the ratings had already been made when this present study was started. The evaluators were not informed of the training program that the

individual teachers had experienced. Both the teacher's self-evaluation and the principal's evaluation contained 11 rating categories, while the coordinator's evaluation listed 9, but the following rating categories were common to the three lists:

1. Planning for instruction
2. Knowledge of subject matter
3. Effective teaching procedures
4. Management of classroom environment
5. Development of classroom discipline and morale
6. Overall evaluation as a first-year teacher

Subjects

The subjects for this study were the 1962 and 1963 Oregon College of Education graduates in elementary education. The Traditional Program had 242 subjects; the Block Program had 79 subjects, making a total of 321.

Data Collection

All data used in this study ~~was~~ WERE supplied by the Registrar's Office and the Office of Field Services of Oregon College of Education. The Registrar's Office supplied the grade point average and the scholastic aptitude test scores. ~~This~~ THESE data ~~was~~ WERE separated according to the training programs of the subjects. The Office of Field Services supplied the evaluation forms sent in by the teacher, by the teacher's principal and the Field Services Coordinator

When the data ~~was~~ WERE thus separated, it became evident that a random selection of subjects for comparison was not feasible because the number of subjects was so small that the groups being compared would be too severely attenuated.

The rating forms had a five-point rating scale for each item which rated the teacher's effectiveness from adequate to very good. For purposes of data analysis, it was assumed that the degree of difference between each rating step was the same. The evaluation terms were then changed to numerical terms by making a direct ratio of rating effectiveness to numerical value, i.e., the more effective the teacher, in the opinion of the rater, the higher the number rating.

The two independent variables throughout the treatment were the instructional program and the sex of the subjects. Analysis of variance was used to measure for Objectives 1, 3 and 4. For Objective 2, a chi square was tabulated. Findings with respect to Objective 5 constitute essentially the investigator's appraisal of the quality and adequacy of the evaluation tools as a means of obtaining accurate information for decision making.

Findings

Objective #1. Analysis of variance of the principals' evaluations indicates a statistically significant difference between the observed effectiveness of teachers trained under the Block and Traditional Programs in favor of the Block-trained subjects (Table 1.2, $p < .05$). Analysis of the Field Services Coordinator's evaluations does not reveal a significant difference in the observed effectiveness (Table 1.4, the .05 level of significance was not attained).

Objective #2. Computation of chi square from enrollment data does not indicate a significant tendency for one sex to choose one program in preference to the other. A small, but not significant, tendency was noted whereby men tended to choose the Block Program over the Traditional (Table 2.1, .05 level not attained).

Objective #3. Analysis of variance of the teachers' self-evaluations does not indicate that one sex scores higher than the other in self-evaluation, when results from both programs are pooled (Table 3.2, .05 level not attained). However, male teachers from the Block Program evaluated themselves higher than males from the Traditional Program ($t = 2.64$, $p < .02$).

Objective #4. Analysis of variance of grade point averages does not indicate that any selective process (intended or otherwise) exists for enrolling capable students (Table 4.2, .05 level not attained).

Objective #5. Both Block and Traditional Programs were designed to produce a better teacher, but the relationship of the evaluation tools used to specific measurable objectives has never been articulated. Any assessment of the evaluation

tools which are now in use is, therefore, difficult. In addition to this, the small number of evaluations which were returned to the Field Services Office may have adversely affected the study, even if the objectives had been known and the evaluation tools had been demonstrated to be accurate.

Discussion

A possible explanation for the findings that the principals' evaluations indicated significant differences between the treatment groups, and the Field Services Coordinators' evaluation did not, may lie in the type of observations that took place. The principals were able to evaluate the teacher on the basis of a total year's performance. It is not uncommon for first-year teachers to experience difficulties during their first year of teaching; especially in the early part. As the year progresses, however, some of these difficulties are resolved. It could be expected that an administrator's year-end evaluation would be influenced more by current than by past teacher performance. He has seen the teacher in action throughout the year under both good and bad conditions. When the evaluation is made at the end of the year it is conceivable that the teacher is rated as he is; not as he was.

In contrast to this, a Coordinator makes his evaluation in the early part or, at the latest, the middle of the school year. Often when the schools are visited by college staff members, not only the teacher but the whole school is prepared well in advance for the coming visitation. The observation is a "snapshot" type at best, since the Coordinator is able to see the teacher in action for a relatively short time. Opportunity to visit with the teacher informally outside of class is restricted because of the Coordinator's tight travel schedule which often requires him to make several visitations in one day. It is conceivable, then, that the "picture" which is taken under these conditions may not accurately represent the teacher. Consequently, differences in the performance of the two groups of teachers might be masked in the Coordinator's ratings.

Examination of the enrollment data serves to reiterate the often-noted and sometimes deplored tendency for men to avoid the field of elementary education. Even

the initiation of a new training program apparently does not induce more men to select the elementary field (Table 2.1).

A teacher's self-image can greatly affect his projected image, which in turn can influence his effectiveness in the classroom. The fact that men from the Block Program rated themselves significantly higher than men from the Traditional Program could be interpreted to mean that "Block" men had a different, in this case more positive, vision of themselves than "Traditional" men. It is conceivable that some experience or combination of experiences during the Block Program produced a change in men which was carried into the classroom.

It is also interesting to note that the principals' ratings gave the same relationship as described above. Men in the Block Program were rated 4.68 points above men in the Traditional Program (Table 1.1). It is possible that the principal saw the projected image of the "Block" men enough to reflect it in his evaluation.

The data analysis for Objective #4 gave no indication that a selective enrollment process exists. The results could be considered suspect, however, because the existing data were incomplete and did not permit purely random selection procedures to be employed. Subjects in the Traditional Program were often transfer students whose records did not furnish data (College Entrance Examination Board or Scholastic Aptitude Test scores) for the study. In addition, many non-transfer students in this program had neither score on their records. An alternate method of determining student ability — comparing grade point averages -- was used, and even these data were not available for some subjects.

As the results indicate from the data analysis for the first four objectives of this study, it appears that the present tools of measurement leave much to be desired. The study was based on data obtained after the teachers completed the teacher education programs("after only" data). Very little is recorded regarding the teachers' initial performance capabilities or their reasons for enrolling in the two programs. Limitations of such studies in which experimental samples cannot be drawn at random at the beginning from a single population are well established.

Specific Conclusions and Recommendations

This study was proposed with the understanding that all data were available and the investigator had merely to collect, tabulate and analyze them. Once the study was begun, however, it soon became apparent that data were in four conditions: (1) some were complete and readily available, (2) some were complete but not readily available, (3) some were incomplete, but readily available and (4) many were incomplete and not readily available.

The first difficulty accompanied data collection in the Registrar's Office as mentioned in the discussion related to Objective #3. It should be made explicit that at no time was any resistance or lack of cooperation encountered by research personnel in collection of data. Office personnel at OCE were agreeable and cooperative from the outset and continued their efforts to accommodate the investigation in every way possible. The greatest obstacle was the lack of a system for organizing information and making it conveniently available. If the Registrar's Office is to fulfill its role as a source of all pertinent data for intra-institutional as well as inter-institutional research, a streamlining of data collection, storage and retrieval is to be recommended.

Another area of difficulty was encountered when the records of the Field Services Office were examined. As was described under a previous section of this report, these records consisted pf three check lists which were filled out by the building principal, the Field Services Coordinator, and the teacher. Both the principal and the teacher sent in their lists at the end of the school year, while the Coordinator made his report at the time of visitation. The Field Services Office received 87 replies from principals for the 242 Traditional subjects (less than 36% response) and 57 replies for the 79 Block subjects (72% response). Altogether the principals responded on 144 of the 321 teachers, for a response of less than 45%.

The teachers were no better when called upon to return their self-evaluations. From the Traditional Program 49 of the 242 replied for a response of 20%, while 44 of the 79 Block subjects replied for a response of over 55%. Altogether 93 teachers of the 321 replied for a response of about 29%.

The fact that many subjects were eliminated because of incomplete data introduced a problem of selectivity in the sample. If a sample is drawn from one type of student population disproportionately, the results of a study may be completely misleading. It is, therefore, vital that the Office of Field Services have complete records on all of the college's graduates in order to accommodate studies needed to evaluate the effectiveness of a program.

Despite the weaknesses of this type of study and problems of data collection, there was some indication of the Block Program's greater effectiveness. The Program certainly merits further attempts at evaluation. A larger investigation with a more sophisticated research design, utilizing before-after methods, would doubtless identify important and distinctive characteristics of the Program. If the staff members involved with the Block Program could state the objectives in measurable terms, evaluation instruments could be developed to assess more adequately the effectiveness of the Program.

The principals who participated in the present study apparently saw some quality that was unique to the Block trainees and rated them higher than Traditional trainees. Further study could identify the quality or qualities that make teachers more effective.

Table 1.1 Means of Principals' Evaluations

Treatment Group	Male	Female
Block	43.18	41.37
Traditional	38.50	39.50

Means represent a composite of 10 items of evaluation, each having a range of 5 points

Table 1.2 Summary of Two-way Analysis of Principals' Evaluations

Source	df	MS	F
Program (P)	1	258.50	4.75*
Sex (S)	1	3.95	—
PxS	1	47.57	--
Error	140	54.42	—

* $p < .05$

Table 1.3 Treatment Group Means of Coordinators' Evaluations

Treatment Group	Male	Female
Block	33.85	32.06
Traditional	34.09	31.52

Means obtained from a composite of 10 items of evaluation, each having a range of 5 points

Table 1.4 Summary of Two-way Analysis of Coordinators' Evaluation

Source	df	MS	F
Program (P)	1	.52	--
Sex (S)	1	122.55	2.98
PxS	1	3.87	--
Error	230	41.10	--

Table 2.1 Computation of Chi Square for Compared Enrollment by Sexes in the Block and Traditional Programs.

Program	Obtained Frequencies			Expected Frequencies		
	Sex			Sex		
	Male	Female	Both	Male	Female	Both
Block	16	63	79	13.29	65.71	79
Traditional	38	204	242	40.71	201.29	242
Both	54	267	321	54	267	321

Table 3.1 Treatment Group Means of Teachers' Self-Evaluations

Treatment Group	Male	Female
Block	48.70	44.61
Traditional	43.43	45.22

Means obtained from a composite of 10 items of evaluation, each having a range of 5 points

Table 3.2 Summary of Two-way Analysis of Teachers' Self-Evaluation

Source	df	MS	F
Program (P)	1	106.4	2.0
Sex (S)	1	24.7	—
PxS	1	165.3	3.2
Error	91	.52	—

Table 4.1 Treatment Group Means of Teachers' Grade Point Averages

Treatment Group	Male	Female
Block	2.6	2.7
Traditional	2.5	2.8

Means obtained by equal group composite; 10 Male, 40 Female

Table 4.2 Summary of Two-way Analysis of Teachers' Grade Point Average

Source	df	MS	F
Program (P)	1	.00	.00
Sex (S)	1	.64	3.76
PxS	1	.16	--
Error	99	.17	--

Oregon College of Education
Monmouth, Oregon

FIRST YEAR TEACHER EVALUATION

1. What do you feel was your most serious problem during the first year teaching assignment? How could the college have helped?

2. How well do you feel your Professional Education Courses prepared you for teaching?

Comments:

Inade-quate	Fair	Ade-quate	Good	Very Good

3. How valuable do you now consider the Student Teaching portion of your preparation?

Inade-quate	Fair	Ade-quate	Good	Very Good

Most valuable contributions:

Most serious weaknesses:

4. How well were you prepared to develop discipline and class morale?

Inade-quate	Fair	Ade-quate	Good	Very Good

5. How well prepared were you to plan instruction?

Inade-quate	Fair	Ade-quate	Good	Very Good

6. How well were you prepared to use effective teaching procedures?

Inade-quate	Fair	Ade-quate	Good	Very Good

7. How well prepared were you to manage the classroom environment and routines?

Inade-quate	Fair	Ade-quate	Good	Very Good

8. How well were you prepared to handle the activity program phase of your school position?

Inade-quate	Fair	Ade-quate	Good	Very Good

9. How well prepared were you to handle the extra duty requirements, lunchroom, hall, etc., of your teaching position?

Inade-quate	Fair	Ade-quate	Good	Very Good

10. What is your over-all evaluation of your success as a beginning teacher?

Inade-quate	Fair	Ade-quate	Good	Very Good

11. In general, then, looking back over your undergraduate program at Oregon College of Education, what were the:

Most valuable contributions:

Most serious weaknesses:

ELEMENTARY ONLY

A. How adequate was your preparation in the following areas:

	Inadequate	Fair	Adequate	Good	Very Good
Language Arts					
Reading					
Art					
Music					
P. E.					
Social Studies					
Science					
Arithmetic					
Spelling					

ELEMENTARY AND SECONDARY

A. If you were visited by a representative of Oregon College of Education during your first year of teaching:

Do you feel that this visit was of value to you? Yes_____ No_____

In what way did you profit from this visit?_____

_____

_____

Were you adequately advised of the visit? Yes_____ No_____

B. Do you feel that there are differences in the philosophy of teaching of this institution and the school district in which you are now working? Yes___No____

If yes, what might some of these differences be?_____

_____

_____

_____

C. What major differences have you observed (if any) in the teaching philosophy of your student teaching supervisor(s) and the requirements of your present situation? _____

_____

_____

_____

Appendix B
Oregon College of Education
Monmouth, Oregon
FIRST YEAR TEACHER EVALUATION - 1962-63

	Inade-quate	Fair	Ade-quate	Good	Very Good
1. How well does he know the subject matter, skills, and materials of grade level or subject matter area in which he teaches?					
2. How well does he develop discipline and class morale?					
3. How well does he plan instructions?					
4. How effective are his teaching procedures?					
5. How well does he manage classroom environment and routines?					
6. How does he react to constructive criticism of a professional nature?					
7. How well does he handle his activity program assignments?					
8. How well does he accept responsibility for extra duty assignments, e.g., lunchroom, hall duty, sports events supervision, dance sponsorship, etc.?					
9. How well does he work as a professional member of the school and community?					
10. What is your over-all evaluation of him as a beginning teacher?					

11. What was the most serious problem faced by the graduate during this first year?

12. Feel free to make any further comments on the reverse side of this sheet. We would be especially interested in comments relating to any marks in the fair or inadequate categories.

_____ Evaluator

_____ Position

Appendix C

OREGON COLLEGE OF EDUCATION

College Representative's Report of Teachers - In - Service

MISS
MRS._____ Date of Observation_____
MR.

School_____ City_____ County_____

Administrator Contacted_____ Position_____

Grade and/or Subjects_____

_____

Graduate E JH SEC OCE SOC EOC

Student Taught: F W Sp Su Supervisor(s)_____ Level_____

Location_____

	Inadequate	Fair	Adequate	Good	Very Good
1. Personal Qualities					
2. Knowledge of Subject Matter					
3. Develop Discipline & Morale					
4. Leader of Pupils					
5. Planning of Instruction					
6. Effective Teaching Procedures					
7. Classroom Environment					
8. Reaction to Prof. Criticism					
9. Overall Evaluation					

Subject(s) Observed_____

Comments by Teacher:

Comments by Administrator or Superintendent:

Summary Remarks: